Case 4:09-cr-01076-PJH Document 40 Filed 02/16/11 Page 1 of 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA OAKLAND DIVISION

United States of America,) Case No. CR 69-61076 PT#
Plaintiff, v.) STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME) UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
	FILED
Artwo Dinz Carillo Defendant.	FEB 1 6 2011
Defendant.	BICHARD W. WIE
For the reasons stated by the parties on the record Speedy Trial Act from, 2011, to	on <u>~/16</u> , 2011, the Court exchinges time under the 3/30, 2011, and finds that the ends of justice rest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18
U.S.C. \S 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this fin	nding and bases this continuance on the following factor(s):
Failure to grant a continuance wou See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).	ald be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
defendants, the nature of the or law, that it is unreasonable to ex	lex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of e prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial shed by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
	ald deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, full due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
	ald unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given mmitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
	ald unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time a, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
IT IS SO ORDERED.	
DATED: 2/16/4	LAUREL BEELER United States Magistrate Judge
STIPULATED: Attorney for Defendant	Assistant United States Attorney